

6. Briefly identify adopted plans for the area and discuss whether the proposed action is compatible with the plan. (For example, the following may be considered: Regional Planning Commission Plans, Transportation Improvement Program, State Transportation Improvement Plan, Local zoning and land use plans, DOT Storm Water Management Plans, others.)

The proposed WIS 64 alternatives are not explicitly mentioned in all area plans; however, the preferred alternatives appear to be compatible with the adopted land use plans for the area. Because the improvements are mainly on-alignment, they have relatively small impacts to adjacent agricultural and conservation lands as compared to off-alignment improvements. The improvement of the roadway could potentially encourage development along the corridor. Some of the development could be unwanted in some of the listed plans, and local governments will need to adopt land use regulations sufficient to manage this potential development.

The adopted land use plans for the proposed WIS 64 corridor areas are listed in Table 6.01-1.

Plan Name	Author and Year
Wisconsin State Highway Plan 2020	Wisconsin DOT (2000)
Translink 21	Wisconsin DOT (1994)
Nonpoint Source Water Pollution Abatement (Priority Watershed Projects)	Wisconsin DNR (1995)
Land Use Policy Plan for West Central Wisconsin	West Central Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission (1978)
Lower Chippewa River Basin Plan	Wisconsin DNR (1996)
St. Croix River Basin Plan	Wisconsin DNR (1994)
St. Croix County Natural Resource Plan	St. Croix County Land and Water Conservation Committee (2000)
St. Croix County Development Management Plan	St. Croix County Planning Department (2000)
The St. Croix Valley Development Design Study	Metropolitan Council (2000)
St. Croix County Outdoor Recreation Plan	St. Croix County Planning Department (2000)
St. Croix County Erosion Control Plan	St. Croix County Land Conservation Committee (1988)
St. Croix County Farmland Preservation Plan	St. Croix County Planning Department (1980)
City of New Richmond Comprehensive Plan	City of New Richmond (2005, working document)
Heartland Towns Comprehensive Plan	Towns of Baldwin, Cylon, Erin Prairie, Hammond, Pleasant Valley, and Stanton (2005, working document)

**Table 6.01-1 Land Use Plans in the WIS 64 Corridor Area**

7. Early coordination with Agencies.

a. Intra-Agency Coordination

i) Bureau of Aeronautics

☐ No - Coordination is not required. Project is not located within 2 miles (3.22 kilometers) of a public or military use airport, nor would the project change the horizontal or vertical alignment of a transportation facility located within 6.44 kilometers (4 miles) of a public use or military airport.

☒ Yes - Coordination has been completed and project effects have been addressed. Explain.

A letter including a project summary, identification of the preferred alternatives, and a request for comments was sent on April 4, 2005. No response has been received.

ii) District Office Real Estate Section

☐ No - Coordination is not required because no inhabited houses or active businesses will be acquired.

☒ Yes - Coordination has been completed. Project effects and relocation assistance have been addressed. Conceptual Stage Relocation Plan attached as Exhibit (Appendix D).

b. Interagency Coordination

STATE AGENCY	COORDINATION	COMMENTS
	Correspondence Attached Y/N	Explain or give results. If no correspondence is attached to this document, indicate when coordination with the agency was initiated and, if available, when coordination was completed.
Agriculture (DATCP)	Y	An invitation letter to the agencies field meeting was sent 8/29/03. No DATCP representative attended this meeting held 9/25/03. A summary of the field meeting was sent 10/06/03. A copy of the field meeting notes is included in Appendix A. A letter including a project summary, identification of the preferred alternatives, and a request for comments was sent on 12/30/04. Alice Halpin from DATCP wrote a letter dated 1/18/05 that stated DATCP's opinions on the various alternatives. This letter is included in Appendix A. Once the study team calculated impacts, an e-mail was sent to DATCP on 4/1/05 requesting guidance on how to proceed with the agricultural impact statement process. In a phone call on 4/5/05, Peter Nauth said he felt that the area around this corridor is changing rapidly and that the land planned to be purchased may change ownership and/or land use before the project is constructed. A letter dated 4/13/05 indicated that because of the time lag associated with the acquisition of property, DATCP prefers to wait to prepare the AIS until closer to the time of acquisition. See attached letter in Appendix A.
Natural Resources (DNR)	Y	An invitation letter to the agencies field meeting was sent 8/29/03. Jim Doperalski Jr. attended the field meeting held 9/25/03. During the meeting, Mr. Doperalski and the other attendees made several comments regarding natural resource and environmental issues. A summary of the field meeting was sent 10/06/03. A second field meeting was held on 8/19/04. Mr. Doperalski also attended this meeting and made several comments such as recommending wetland avoidance techniques, staying on alignment as much as possible, and using a roundabout at the four-corners intersection. A copy of the meeting notes from this second field meeting is included in Appendix A. A letter from the DNR dated 10/22/04 gave recommendations regarding waterways, wetlands, uplands, and wildlife. A letter including a project summary, identification of the preferred alternatives, and a request for comments was sent to the DNR on 12/30/04. A letter dated 2/3/05 was sent to the Bureau of Endangered Resources requesting information on endangered resources. No further correspondence has been received.
State Historical Society (SHS)	N	An invitation letter to the agencies field meeting was sent 8/29/03. No SHS representative attended this meeting held 9/25/03. A summary of the field meeting was sent 10/06/03. A letter including a project summary, identification of the preferred alternatives, and a request for comments was sent on 12/30/04. No comments have been received. The Section 106 form was sent on 03/18/06 to BEES for forwarding to SHS. No correspondence is attached.

Others: Legislative Fiscal Bureau	Y	An invitation letter to the agencies field meeting was sent 8/29/03. No LFB representative attended this meeting held 9/25/03. A summary of the field meeting was sent 10/06/03. A letter including a project summary, identification of the preferred alternatives, and a request for comments was sent on 12/30/04. No comments have been received. It has been our experience that LFB typically does not comment on these types of projects. No correspondence is attached.
West Central Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission (WCWRPC)		An invitation letter to the agencies field meeting was sent 8/29/03. No WCWRPC representative attended this meeting held 9/25/03. A summary of the field meeting was sent 10/06/03. A letter including a project summary, identification of the preferred alternatives, and a request for comments was sent on 12/30/04. In a 4/5/05 phone call, Don Kush indicated that WCWRPC is not very involved in transportation projects once they enter the WisDOT system and that they did not have any comments at this time. The Grants and Development Notification Form (DT1916) was sent on 4/5/05. The completed form was returned and dated 4/7/05 stating that WCWRPC was interested in the project and requested opportunity to comment prior to location. Correspondence is attached in Appendix A.
Governor's Northern Office		An invitation letter to the agencies field meeting was sent 8/29/03. No representative from the Governor's Northern Office attended this meeting held 9/25/03. A summary of the field meeting was sent 10/06/03. A letter including a project summary, identification of the preferred alternatives, and a request for comments was sent on 4/5/05. No comments have been received on the project.

#### FEDERAL AGENCY

Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP)	N	Not Applicable.
Corps of Engineers (COE)	N	An invitation letter to the agencies field meeting was sent 8/29/03. No COE representative attended this meeting held 9/25/03. A summary of the field meeting was sent 10/06/03. A letter including a project summary, identification of the preferred alternatives, and a request for comments was sent on 12/30/04. In a 4/6/05 phone call, Jim Wienzierl said he would probably not have comments but would like to have the project summary letter sent directly to him and he can then give comments as he sees fit. The project summary letter was sent to Mr. Wienzierl on 4/7/05. No comments have been received.

Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)	Y	<p>An invitation letter to the agencies field meeting was sent 8/29/03. No EPA representative attended this meeting held 9/25/03. A summary of the field meeting was sent 10/06/03. A letter including a project summary, identification of the preferred alternatives, and a request for comments was sent on 12/30/04. In a 02/02/05 letter, Kenneth A. Westlake, Chief of the NEPA Implementation Section of the EPA's Office of Science, Ecosystems, and Communities, commented on the need to provide information in the EA on future congestion and delay levels on WIS 64 and whether these exceed operational thresholds and by how much. Mr. Westlake also expressed concern that the scoping material provided had already screened out feasible alternatives prior to undergoing a NEPA analysis in the EA. He recommended considering a sufficient number of reasonable alternatives for comparison in the EA. Lastly, he suggested the study team discuss in the document whether they have consulted with the Wisconsin SHPO regarding the archaeological site within the study area.</p> <p>A project team response letter was sent on 05/05/05 stating that Mr. Westlake's concerns would be addressed in the EA document. The study follows the NEPA process. Correspondence is attached in Appendix A.</p>
National Park Service (NPS)	Yes	<p>An invitation letter to the agencies field meeting was sent 8/29/03. Nick Chenvance from the NPS Midwest Regional Office sent a fax on 9/5/03 stating that the NPS has no comment on the proposed action. The fax is attached in Appendix A. No NPS representative attended the field meeting held 9/25/03. A summary of the field meeting was sent 10/06/03. A letter including a project summary, identification of the preferred alternative, and a request for comments was sent on 12/30/04. No additional comments have been received.</p>
Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS)	N	<p>An invitation letter to the agencies field meeting was sent 8/29/03. No NRCS representative attended this meeting held 9/25/03. A summary of the field meeting was sent 10/06/03. A letter including a project summary, identification of the preferred alternatives, and a request for comments was sent on 12/30/04. An e-mail was sent on 4/5/05 to follow up and ask for comments. Jay Custer replied and suggested contacting Larry Natzke. A project summary letter was sent to Larry Natzke on 4/5/05. No comments have been received on the project. No correspondence is attached.</p>
US Coast Guard (USCG)	No	Not Applicable.
US Fish & Wildlife Service (FWS)	Yes	<p>An invitation letter to the agencies field meeting was sent 8/29/03. No FWS representative attended this meeting held 9/25/03. A summary of the field meeting was sent 10/06/03. A letter including a project summary, identification of the preferred alternatives, and a request for comments was sent on 12/30/04. In a 02/09/05 phone call to Joel Trick, FWS, Mr. Trick stated he had no specific resource concerns. Generally, his main concern is wetlands and impacts to FWS lands in the area. He asked that we verify that none are impacted as that would create 6(f) concerns. Further analysis shows that though a temporary construction easement may be required from a FWS waterfowl production area on the north side of WIS 64 near New Richmond, no permanent right-of-way would be required. Additional coordination was completed with Chet McCarty and David McConnell of FWS during Summer 2005. E-mail was received from Mr. McConnell stating that a letter signed by the District Director would be sent. A letter from Mr. McConnell was received 12/09/05 stating that the proposed improvements do not appear to adversely impact the FWS waterfowl production area. Correspondence is attached in Appendix A.</p>

Other(Identify)  Native American Tribes	Y	<p>Related to the US Department of Interior, the Native American Tribes found on the standard contact list for projects in Wisconsin were sent the Initial Notification Letter to Native American Parties dated 9/5/03. This letter also included information on the agency field meeting. No representatives from Native American Tribes attended this meeting held 9/25/03. Archaeological investigations identified the Breault Site near the corridor requiring a Phase 2 investigation. The site was determined to be eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. The draft Archaeological Report and NPS Form 10-900 were sent to all of the Native American contacts on 8/10/05. A phone call was received on 8/22/05 from Wanda McFaggen representing St. Croix Tribal Historic Preservation. Ms. McFaggen requested a copy of the Initial Notification letter from September 2003 (one was sent the same day); she stated that the St. Croix opposed the artifacts from the Breault Site being curated in Milwaukee. Ms. McFaggen also asked that the project team consult with Jerry Smith (Lac Courte Oreilles Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians of Wisconsin) and Jay Toth (Ho-Chunk Nation Archaeologist). Additional consultation resulted in a letter documenting that artifacts from the Breault Site will be curated at the Mississippi Valley Archaeology Center.</p> <p>Correspondence is attached in Appendix A.</p>
---	---	--

c. Local Government Coordination

LOCAL UNIT OF GOVERNMENT	COORDINATION	COMMENTS
	Correspondence Attached Y/N	Explain or give results. If no correspondence is attached to this document, indicate when coordination with the agency was initiated and, if available, when coordination was completed.
St. Croix County: Highway and Planning Departments	Y	<p>An invitation letter to the agencies field meeting was sent 9/5/03 (included in Appendix A). Ellen Denzer, from the Planning Department, attended this meeting held 9/25/03. A summary of the field meeting was sent 10/06/03 (included in Appendix A). On 10/10/03, a copy of the WIS 64 Corridor Study was sent to Ellen Denzer. An invitation to the first Public Information Meeting (PIM 1) was sent 11/13/03. Tim Ramberg, St. Croix County Highway Commissioner and Dave Fodroczi, St. Croix County Director of Planning, attended this meeting held 11/18/03. A summary of PIM 1 was sent 12/02/03. An invitation letter to a local officials meeting was sent 3/15/05. Ellen Denzer and Dave Fodroczi from the Planning Department and Tim Ramberg from the Highway Department attended this meeting held 3/31/05. An invitation to PIM 2 was sent in mid-March 2005. Summaries of the March local officials meeting and April PIM were sent in early May 2005. A letter was sent 5/10/05 asking for input from local officials regarding local access issues near the Willow River crossing (between 190th Street and 200th Street). Written comments were received in a 7/22/05 joint letter from Tim Ramberg and Dave Fodroczi. A project update was sent 9/20/05 outlining the WisDOT-preferred alternative and announcing PIM 3. Written comments were received in a 10/24/05 letter from Tim Ramberg. The results of the noise analysis were sent to local officials 5/31/06.</p> <p>Correspondence is included in Appendix B.</p>

City of New Richmond		An invitation letter to the agencies field meeting was sent 9/5/03 (included in Appendix A). No City of New Richmond representative attended the field meeting held 9/25/03. A summary of the field meeting was sent 10/06/03. An invitation to the first PIM 1 was sent 11/13/03. A summary of PIM 1 was sent 12/02/03. An invitation letter to a local officials meeting was sent 3/15/05. Bob Barbian from the City of New Richmond attended this meeting held 3/31/05. Some revision to the local streets proposed for Stage 3 were made at Bob Barbian's request. An invitation to PIM 2 was sent in mid-March 2005. Summaries of the March local officials meeting and April PIM were sent in early May 2005. A project update was sent 9/20/05 outlining the WisDOT-preferred alternative and announcing PIM 3. The results of the noise analysis were sent to local officials 5/31/06.
Town of Cylon		An invitation letter to the agencies field meeting was sent 9/5/03 (included in Appendix A). No Town of Cylon representative attended the field meeting held 9/25/03. A summary of the field meeting was sent 10/06/03. An invitation to the PIM 1 was sent 11/13/03. A summary of PIM 1 was sent 12/02/03. An invitation letter to a local officials meeting was sent 3/15/05. No Town of Cylon representative attended this meeting held 3/31/05. An invitation to PIM 2 was sent in mid-March 2005. Summaries of the March local officials meeting and April PIM were sent in early May 2005. A letter was sent 5/10/05 asking for input from local officials regarding local access issues near the Willow River crossin (between 190th Street and 200th Street). A project update was sent 9/20/05 outlining the WisDOT-preferred alternative and announcing PIM 3. The results of the noise analysis were sent to local officials 5/31/06.
Town of Emerald		An invitation letter to the agencies field meeting was sent 9/5/03 (included in Appendix A). No Town of Emerald representative attended the field meeting held 9/25/03. A summary of the field meeting was sent 10/06/03. An invitation to PIM 1 was sent 11/13/03. A summary of PIM 1 was sent 12/02/03. An invitation letter to a local officials meeting was sent 3/15/05. Rene Speer from the Town of Emerald attended this meeting held 3/31/05. An invitation to PIM 2 was sent in mid-March 2005. Summaries of the March local officials meeting and April PIM were sent in early May 2005. A project update was sent 9/20/05 outlining the WisDOT-referred alternative and announcing PIM 3. The results of the noise analysis were sent to local officials 5/31/06.
Town of Erin Prairie		An invitation letter to the agencies field meeting was sent 9/5/03 (included in Appendix A). No Town of Erin Prairie representative attended the field meeting held 9/25/03. A summary of the field meeting was sent 10/06/03. An invitation to PIM 1 was sent 11/13/03. A summary of PIM 1 was sent 12/02/03. An invitation letter to a local officials meeting was sent 3/15/05. A Town of Erin Prairie representative did not attend this meeting held 3/31/05. An invitation to PIM 2 was sent in mid-March 2005. Summaries of the March local officials meeting and April PIM were sent in early May 2005. A project update was sent 9/20/05 outlining the WisDOT-preferred alternative and announcing PIM 3. The results of the noise analysis were sent to local officials 5/31/06.

Town of Forest		<p>An invitation letter to the agencies field meeting was sent 9/5/03 (included in Appendix A). Carl Cress and Leon Helgeson representing the Town of Forest attended the field meeting held 9/25/03. A summary of the field meeting was sent 10/06/03. An invitation to PIM 1 was sent 11/13/03. A summary of PIM 1 was sent 12/02/03. An invitation letter to a local officials meeting was sent 3/15/05. No Town of Forest representative attended this meeting held 3/31/05. An invitation to PIM 2 was sent in mid-March 2005. Summaries of the March local officials meeting and April PIM were sent in early May 2005. A project update was sent 9/20/05 outlining the WisDOT-preferred alternative and announcing PIM 3. The results of the noise analysis were sent to local officials 5/31/06.</p>
Town of Richmond		<p>An invitation letter to the agencies field meeting was sent 9/5/03 (included in Appendix A). No Town of Richmond representative attended the field meeting held 9/25/03. A summary of the field meeting was sent 10/06/03. An invitation to PIM 1 was sent 11/13/03. A summary of PIM 1 was sent 12/02/03. An invitation letter to a local officials meeting was sent 3/15/05. No Town of Richmond representative attended this meeting held 3/31/05. An invitation to PIM 2 was sent in mid-March 2005. Summaries of the March local officials meeting and April PIM were sent in early May 2005. A project update was sent 9/20/05 outlining the WisDOT-preferred alternative and announcing PIM 3. The results of the noise analysis were sent to local officials 5/31/06.</p>
Town of Stanton		<p>An invitation letter to the agencies field meeting was sent 9/5/03. Walter Anderson from the Town of Stanton attended this meeting held 9/25/03. A summary of the field meeting was sent 10/06/03. An invitation to PIM 1 was sent 11/13/03. A summary of PIM 1 was sent 12/02/03. An invitation letter to a local officials meeting was sent 3/15/05. Richard Hesselink representing the Town of Stanton attended this meeting held 3/31/05. An invitation to PIM 2 was sent in mid-March 2005. Summaries of the March local officials meeting and April PIM were sent in early May 2005. A letter was sent 5/10/05 asking for input from local officials regarding local access issues near the Willow River crossing (between 190th Street and 200th Street). Richard Hesselink provided feedback via a telephone call to project representatives on 6/6/05. A project update was sent 9/20/05 outlining the WisDOT-preferred alternative and announcing PIM 3. The results of the noise analysis were sent to local officials 5/31/06.</p>
Town of Star Prairie		<p>An invitation letter to the agencies field meeting was sent 9/5/03 (included in Appendix A). No Town of Star Prairie representative attended the field meeting held 9/25/03. A summary of the field meeting was sent 10/06/03. An invitation PIM 1 was sent 11/13/03. A summary of PIM 1 was sent 12/02/03. An invitation letter to a local officials meeting was sent 3/15/05. Doug Rivard representing the Town of Star Prairie attended this meeting held 3/31/05. An invitation to PIM 2 was sent in mid-March 2005. Summaries of the March local officials meeting and April PIM were sent in early May 2005. A project update was sent 9/20/05 outlining the WisDOT-preferred alternative and announcing PIM 3. The results of the noise analysis were sent to local officials 5/31/06.</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS	EFFECTS				
	Adverse	Benefit	None	*N/A	Comments
SOCIO-ECONOMIC FACTORS					
General Economics	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Congestion on WIS 64/US 63 will be less with the preferred alternative than with the No Build Alternative. Mobility in the region will be substantially increased, aiding the shipment of goods and services. This will create economic benefits throughout West Central Wisconsin. See the General Economics Factor Sheet.
Community & Residential	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	24 residences (28 buildings) would be relocated by the preferred alternative. Each resident and property owner would be eligible for relocation assistance according to the Federal Uniform Relocation Act of 1972. Construction of the preferred alternative will benefit the local community by improving mobility and safety compared to the No Build Alternative. See the Community and Residential Factor Sheet.
Economic Development and Business	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Zero to three businesses (three buildings) would be relocated by the preferred alternative. Each business and property owner would be eligible for relocation assistance according to the Federal Uniform Relocation Act of 1972. Construction of the preferred alternative will benefit economic deveopment and business by improving mobility and safety compared to the No Build Alternative. See the Economic Development and Business Factor Sheet.
Agriculture	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Six farm buildings (four houses and two outbuildings) would be relocated by the preferred alternative. The four single-family homes are included in the community and residential effects listed above. About 254 acres of farmland would be converted to highway right-of-way. A local road system is proposed to provide alternate access and prevent parcels from becoming severed. An Agricultural Impact Statement (AIS) has not been completed in conjunction with this Environmental Assessment because improvements are not expected until well into the future for this project (confirmed with DATCP). With the considerable residential growth and resulting farmland conversion occurring in St. Croix County, some of this land may not be farmland when the project is actually constructed, particularly with the later stages. An AIS will be completed as construction is more imminent and corridor land use is more predictable. See the Agricultural Impact Evaluation Sheet. Construction of the preferred alternative will benefit the local agriculture by improving mobility and safety in the tranportation of agricultural goods to market compared to the No Build Alternative. See the Agriculture Impact Factor Sheet.
Environmental Justice	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	It is not believed that any concentrated minority, elderly, low-income, or handicapped populations exist along the WIS 64/US 63 study corridor. Based on local demographics and observations from the Conceptual Stage Relocation Plan, it is aticipated that 2 persons of minority ethnicities, 7 elderly persons, 9 disabled persons, and 6 persons qualifying as low-income will be impacted by the preferred alternative (out of the 60 persons directly impacted). See the Environmental Justice Factor Sheet.



## NATURAL ENVIRONMENT FACTORS

Wetlands	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The current corridor affects existing wetlands with past impacts resulting from filling, stormwater runoff, and water level changes from past ditching and draining. The preferred alternative would convert approximately 6.7 acres of wetland to highway right-of-way and impact an additional 6.1 acres that lie within the existing right-of-way, all of which would be mitigated. The preferred alternative has been developed to provide a corridor that will operate acceptably and safely for the foreseeable future while minimizing adverse impacts to wetlands and other sensitive habitats. See the Wetlands Factor Sheet.
Streams & Floodplains	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The preferred alternative crosses the Willow River and associated floodplain. The Willow River is considered a Trout Water (class II and III). Additional runoff from increased impervious area could produce an adverse impact on the river. Best Management Practices (BMPs) will be implemented for stormwater and erosion control. See the Streams & Floodplains Factor Sheet.
Lakes or Other Open Water	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The preferred alternative impacts Hart Lake. Additional runoff from increased impervious area could produce an adverse impact on the lake. BMPs will be implemented for stormwater and erosion control. See the Lakes or Other Open Water Factor Sheet.
Upland Habitat	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No impacts to Upland Habitat are anticipated.
Erosion Control	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Road construction could potentially affect erosion control, but BMPs will be implemented according to all governing ordinances and policies for both the construction phase and for long-term management. See the Erosion Control Factor Sheet.
Storm Water Management	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Road construction could potentially affect stormwater quality and quantity; however, stormwater management measures including best management practices will be implemented both during construction and for long-term management. See the Stormwater Management Factor Sheet.

## PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT FACTORS

Air Quality	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	This project is exempt from permit requirements under Wisconsin Administrative Code Chapter NR 411. No substantial impacts to air quality are expected.
Construction Stage Sound Quality	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	WisDOT Standard Specifications 107.8(6) and 108.7.1 will apply.
Traffic Noise	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Future sound levels will produce a noise impact. See the Traffic Noise Factor Sheet.

## CULTURAL ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS

Section 4(f) and 6(f)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No adverse impacts to 4(f) or 6(f) properties are anticipated. Minor impacts to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) Waterfowl Production Area (WPA) located on the north side of WIS 64 just east of New Richmond are anticipated because of grading. The impacts are not expected to affect the quality or operation of the WPA. Correspondence with FWS is included in Appendix A.
Historic Resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Not Applicable. An historical reconnaissance and evaluation study of the area of potential effect did not produce any properties or structures potentially eligible for the National Register of Historic

					Places. The findings of the study are available upon request.
Archaeological Resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Phase 2 investigations were carried out on two sites near the Willow River. One site has been determined to be potentially eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. The preferred alternative remains as close to the existing alignment as possible adjacent to this site and only impacts areas that have been previously disturbed. See the Section 106 Form included in Appendix D. The archaeological report is available upon request.
Hazardous Substances or USTs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Nine sites of potential environmental concern were identified within one-half mile of the proposed alignment. Of these sites, 5 appear to require no further action while 4 may need further investigation depending on the required excavation depths for the construction of the roundabout intersection at WIS 64/STH 46/US 63 and the potential need to acquire right-of-way adjacent to the sites. These investigations would occur just prior to construction of the roadway. Initially, the existence of hazardous substances or underground storage tanks (USTs) in the project corridor would be an adverse effect because of additional costs required for corrective action. However, the improved environmental conditions resulting from corrective action would be an overall benefit. See the Hazardous Substances or USTs Factor Sheet.
Aesthetics	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Impacts on the rural character of the land are minimized by the preferred alternative remaining on-alignment as much as possible. See the Aesthetics Factor Sheet for more information on this topic.
Coastal Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Not Applicable.
Other	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Secondary Effects</p> <p>Increased capacity and the resulting increased accessibility could enable some dispersion of residential development in the area of the WIS 64 corridor. Keeping the highway improvements on alignment may cause highway-oriented commercial land uses to locate near access points along the WIS 64 corridor.</p> <p>Cumulative Effects</p> <p>The cumulative effects of the preferred alternative include the direct effects of its construction and the secondary effects spurred by the roadway improvements. The cumulative effects will impact farmland, wetlands, and stormwater runoff within and adjacent to the WIS 64 corridor. The extent of the cumulative effects on farmland is anticipated to be moderate with the majority of the secondary effects resulting from residential and commercial development around the eastern periphery of New Richmond. The WIS 64 project, combined with other roadway projects that make this region more accessible, may increase or accelerate area residential development. Much of this development is likely to occur even without construction of the preferred alternative because of the rapid growth of St. Croix County as a whole. Stated another way, the preferred alternative will help generate the planned development of the area and will accommodate the additional traffic that will result. Through coordination with local agencies and appropriate jurisdictions, future cumulative effects will be mitigated. The extent of the cumulative effects on the wetlands and stormwater is anticipated to be small. See the cumulative effects discussion on the Environmental Issues Basic Sheet for additional information on this topic.</p>

\* N/A – Blacked out cells in this column require a check in at least one of the other columns.

ENVIRONMENTAL COST MATRIX  
Transportation Improvements

Environmental Issue	Unit Measure	Alternatives/Sections						
		SEGMENT 1 (WIS 64) WIS 65 to US 63 S			SEGMENT 2 (WIS 64) US 63 S to County D		SEGMENT 3 (US 63) WIS 64 to County Q	
		Stage 1 (Intermediate Improvements) <sup>1</sup>	Stage 2 (Four-Lane Facility with At-Grade Intersections)	Stage 3 (WIS 64 Access Control - Local Road Enhancements)	Stage 1 (Intermediate Improvements) <sup>2</sup>	Stage 2 (Four-Lane Facility with At-Grade Intersections)	Stage 3 (Grade Separation at US 63 North)	Stage 1 (Intermediate Improvements)
Project Length	Mi (Km)	7.2 (11.6)	7.2 (11.6)	7.2 (11.6)	6.0 (9.7)	6.0 (9.7)	6.0 (9.7)	4.0 (6.4)
Cost \$				Grade Sep. – Local Roads				
Construction	Million \$	\$2.2 Million <sup>1</sup>	\$18.0 Million	\$8.0 Million - \$20.9 Million	\$3.8 Million	\$15.0 Million	\$2.0 Million	\$0.2 Million
Real Estate	Million \$	< \$0.1 Million	\$2.3 Million	\$1.8 Million - \$0.6 Million	< \$0.1 Million	\$0.6 Million	< \$0.1 Million	< \$0.1 Million
Total	Million \$	\$2.2 Million	\$20.3 Million	\$9.8 Million - \$21.5 Million	\$3.8 Million	\$15.6 Million	\$2.0 Million	\$0.2 Million
Land Conversions								
Total Area Converted to R/W	Acres (Hectares)	0.56 (0.23)	73.29 (29.66)	27.24 – 136.85 (11.02 ) – (55.38)	9.89 (4.00)	48.83 (19.76)	0.92 (0.37)	0.28 (0.11)
Wetland Area Converted to R/W <sup>3</sup>	Acres (Hectares)	0.00 (0.00)	0.93 (0.38)	0.00 – 1.03 (0.00) – (0.42)	0.15 (0.01)	4.56 (1.85)	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)
Upland Area Converted to R/W	Acres (Hectares)	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 – 0.00 (0.00) – (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)
Other Area Converted to R/W	Acres (Hectares)	0.56 (0.23)	72.36 (29.28)	27.24 – 135.82 (11.02) – (55.38)	9.74 (3.94)	44.27 (17.92)	0.92 (0.37)	0.28 (0.11)
Real Estate								
Number of Farms Affected	Number	~ 4	~ 13	~ 17 (total)	~ 7	~ 18	1	~ 5
Total Area From Farm Operations Required	Acres (Hectares)	0.56 (0.23)	62.21 (25.18)	24.31 – 116.332 (9.84) – (47.07)	9.71 (3.93)	40.00 (16.19)	0.92 (0.37)	0.28 (0.11)
AIS Required?	Yes/No	No <sup>4</sup>	No <sup>4</sup>	No <sup>4</sup>	No <sup>4</sup>	No <sup>4</sup>	No <sup>4</sup>	No <sup>4</sup>
Farmland Rating	Score	Not Evaluated	Not Evaluated	Not Evaluated	Not Evaluated	Not Evaluated	Not Evaluated	Not Evaluated
Total Buildings Required	Number	None	12	13 - 0	None	3	None	None
Housing Units Required	Number	None	10	11 - 0	None	3	None	None
Commercial Units Required	Number	None	0 to 3	None	None	None	None	None
Other Buildings or Structures Required	Number (Type)	None	3 off-premise signs	None	None	None	None	None
Flood Plain	Yes/No	Yes – Pond south of Wis 64, between 140 <sup>th</sup> and 142 <sup>nd</sup> streets; and Willow	Yes – Pond south of Wis 64, between 140 <sup>th</sup> and 142 <sup>nd</sup> streets; and	Yes – Pond south of Wis 64, between 140 <sup>th</sup> and 142 <sup>nd</sup> streets; and Willow	No	No		No

<sup>1</sup> Includes roundabout at US 64/WIS 46 intersection.  
<sup>2</sup> Includes the sweeping curve construction at the US 63 North intersection.  
<sup>3</sup> Area shown is outside of existing R/W, these quantities will be less than those reported in the Wetlands Impact Evaluation Factor Sheet.  
<sup>4</sup> Because of the anticipated time frame for construction, correspondence with the Department of Agriculture Trade and Consumer Protection indicates a preference to complete an AIS at a later date.